

Lead King Loop Working Group Notes
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019

Proposed Outcomes:

- To discover interests of the participants.
- To establish Working Group structure.
- Discussion of proposed process steps and issues for the collaborative to work on.
- Determine next steps.

Proposed Agenda

Attending: Maddie Rehn, Corinne Truesdale, Marlene Crosby, Chris Cox, Ron Leach, Rob (Forest Service), Manette Anderson and Terry Langley (notes).

1:00 pm Welcome - agreement of outcomes and meeting agenda – Maddie explained that she was part of the group through WCU. The goal is two-fold - assess impact of the increased usage of the LKL, opportunities to respond to those pressures.

Why is the Crystal River Valley important to you? The goal is to make recommendation that address concerns of most of the group. Maddie – to advocate for a fair, open process rather than on outcomes. Marlene – the county's interest is to address concerns of their constituents – the citizens of Crystal and others in the area. How can we provide a quality experience that does not change citizen's way of life at the same time as protecting resources. Corinne – her role is to be the graduate student resource as well as to work toward meeting the goals of the group. Rob – to try to uphold the interest of the Forest Service – natural resource protection and to make sure forest visitors are protected and the FS policies are upheld. To be a good neighbor to Marble & Crystal. Chris – natural resource/environment protection and protecting life style - vehicles. Find a balance. Manette – personal impact, address ecological, historical, environmental, recreational topics that are unique to the area. Preserve and protect the area. Working together. Ron – represent the various interests of the citizens and property owners of the Town of Marble. For many, it is a quality of life issue. For some, commercial/economic interests. Balance between sustainability/economic & business.

Ron reported that there are approximately 20 truck/trailer parking spaces. They are full in the summer with 3-4 ATVs on each so 60-80 ATVs with maybe 100 people. Maddie suggested a visitor use or destination survey to quantify why people are coming to the area. Chris said that he feels the vast majority are coming to see the Mill.

1:40 Establishment of Working Group structure Review draft handout including ground rules, group roles, decision-making process, and communication (both internal and external). Maddie said her work falls under the umbrella of conflict resolution/collaboration. Chris suggested designating someone to enforce the rules. Maddie said she is happy to take that as part of her role. Undiscussable issues –

Corinne is not aware of specific conflicts between the various members of the group. Marlene said this may come up when we move to public comment. Ron said that member groups listed now have jurisdictional responsibilities. Share information when the group is ready to share. Each agency needs to collaborate with the members from that agency so that there is one "vote" or voice. Communication has come from Ron via email and he will try to get them out at least a week ahead. A list of individuals and their email address will be done. There needs to be a platform so that everyone can go to that place for information – google drive. There can be both internal and external platforms. Ron said that documents are subject to the Colorado Open Records Act and can be given upon request. Chris asked that someone be named spokesperson for communication with the media. Maddie said it is usually the convener or the facilitator. Ron said that information going out needs to be approved by the lead agency. He asked about the Forest Service and Rob said they do not have a PIO currently and, although they could speak to FS issues, not for the whole group. After discussion, it was agreed that the facilitator (Maddie) would be the proper person. She will discuss this with the University, Ron and Marlene further. She said that a steering committee could contribute to this.

2:15 Break

2:30 Discussion of proposed process steps Review draft process matrix v. 1 – Collaboration in Natural resources Management – Problem Complexity

- Multiple parties, issues, time considerations

- Conflicting values

- Policy & precedent

Collaboration – negotiation amongst parties

Getting Started – initiate, assess the situation, design a process

Defining Problems – gather/share information, clarify and define the problem, clarify & share interests

Finding Options – generate options, evaluation options, reach an agreement

Implementing Agreements – working together, following through, specify responsibilities – asses and adapt.

See list

Corinne said this is a way to learn what information is already available and what they need to get. Rob said the Policy & Enforcement should also involve the sheriff. Manette asked about the scope in terms of what we do, how we implement and will it be successful. Corinne explained that LKL is the magnet that brings all the components together. Smaller pieces of the larger puzzle. Maddie shared information of Marlene – Marlene says we need to identify the geographical area. the loop, spurs to Crested Butte, spurs to Marble. Each entities action affects the other entities.

3: 00 Problem Definition – Problem statement takes interests and issues and combines them.

- What is the use on Lead King Loop vs just coming to Marble/Crystal

- Noise

- Erosion

Human waste

Everyone wants facilities but who will manage? Currently use the private facilities.
Chris asked about Forest Service guidelines. Wag Bags. Bury, developed facilities.

Ron - degradation of quality of life

Manette – not infrastructure to handle capacity.

Rob – forest is divided into compartments in fs plan. OHV on LKL doesn't meet the same standards for solitude that wilderness area does. FS will not change designation unless/until the fs plan is revised. FS problem – can fs effectively manage the number of visitors currently using. Consider partners in adjoining land. Number affects every problem.

Maddie – talk to other places tackling the same issues.

Rob – need long term solution. Lots of data needed.

Chris – how is FS working with Pitkin Co on similar issues and how did they do it in such a short amount of time. Rob – county voted. \$ for enforcement.

Environmental degradation

Safety – on the road. Too many, access of emergency, injuries, inadequate vehicles, inadequate driving experience,

What are the issues surrounding the community of Marble related to the Lead King Loop? -

3:30 Next Meeting(s) and schedule – 3 hours. Zoom for those who can't attend. 10 a.m. – 1 p.m. Date to be confirmed with the Forest Service.

3:50 Public Comment

4:00 Adjourn